CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN: UPDATE 2013
PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (AC) MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY
NOVEMBER 9, 2010
DOUBLE TREE HOTEL
SACRAMENTO, CA
2001 POINT WEST WAY
SACRAMENTO, CA 95815

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

California Water Plan (CWP) Executive Facilitator, Lisa Beutler, MWH, welcomed meeting participants to the morning session of the first CWP *Update 2013*Public Advisory Committee (Public AC) meeting. She noted the meeting purposes to adopt the group charter, map out the work that the Public AC would be doing for Update 2013 and review a proposed structure for Regional Forums and topic-based caucuses.

Dale Hoffman-Floerke, Deputy Director, Department of Water Resources (DWR), thanked meeting participants for their attendance and expressed appreciation for those that had also been involved in previous CWP updates. She affirmed that the theme for the previous, CWP Update 2009, was integrated regional water management (IRWM) as well as sustainability. She noted it was the first time that integrated flood management had been so directly addressed within the CWP.

Presentation: Where We Have Been And Where We Are- The Water Plans Of This Millennium

Statewide Integrated Water Management Manager, Kamyar Guivetchi, also welcomed participants to the Public AC. He reported there have been nine updates of the CWP in the past and there had been concern that some of the documents produced were more of a data book than a policy document. He explained this has changed in the past 10 years. By incorporating a more open and transparent approach and utilizing a strategic planning framework, the document has become policy focused. He emphasized the need for regional planning and noted a need for regions to coordinate among one another.

Kamyar reviewed recent CWP updates, and highlighted the introduction of a State Agency Steering Committee (SASC) during Update 2009, to help coordinate the overall State Water Planning effort. This initiative facilitated the introduction of the State Companion Plans section of the CWP.

Presentation: Where We Are Going

Paul Massera, DWR, previewed the proposed structure for Update 2013, discussed 18 potential enhancements to the 2013 Update and asked how the Public AC might prioritize enhancements to the plan.

He noted the CWP team was currently in a scoping process where ideas generated during previous Update planning cycles, but not yet addressed, were being carried over and re-evaluated to determine their importance and relevance within Update 2013.

He also reviewed key deliverables for the CWP including an estimates report, a strategic plan, and future scenarios. He noted that future scenarios will need to be focused more at a regional level. He

also noted that State Companion Plans would be continued and updated throughout the new plan and described efforts to integrate Federal efforts into Update 2013.

Additional planned improvements to Update 2013 will include making it more user friendly in both presentation and accessibility to plan information.

Group Discussion: Enhancement Priorities

Meeting participants joined discussion groups of Public AC members to review 20 proposed Update 2013 enhancements (listed below) and prioritize them.

A. Expand integration of Water Quality throughout the Water Plan
B. Continue to integrate flood planning and water management into the Water Plan
C. Expand groundwater analysis in Water Plan
D. Incorporate near-coastal ecosystems and issues; add relevant State agencies to Steering Committee
E. Expand linkages between -land use and water management
F. Roll up Urban Water Management Plans into regional reports/plans
G. Create an Economic and Financial Planning work team
H. Clarify and refine State leadership
I. Increase federal involvement in Water Plan process; add federal companion plans
J. Tribal
K. Improve data management and sharing
L. Enhance interdisciplinary collaboration/integration of technical disciplines and analysis
M. Add evaluation metrics and sustainability indicators
N. Develop and track CA water management measures of success
O. Estimate Environmental Water "Needs" *(beyond regulatory requirements)*
P. Implement a "Living Document" initiative
Q. Incorporate shorter planning horizon(s)
R. Recommend removal of outdated codes/laws

(More information about questions and enhancements may be found in the Meeting Workbook, available on-line on the Water Plan Calendar and Meeting Materials Page.

Below are priorities and feedback generated by the discussion groups.

Group 1:

- A: Water Quality- The group felt that this was a very important topic for surface water and groundwater, desalination and both potable and recycled water issues. They also suggested including groundwater in under Quantitative analysis.
- G: Create and economic and financial planning work team.
- M: Data, metrics, analysis: suggested adding sustainability indicators..

Group 2:

- B: Integration of flood and water management- needs to be integrated with land use planning. Consider storm water. Risk assessment. Stronger economic drivers.
- C: Expand Groundwater analysis: This is building on SBX 76. There are some flaws in the leg package in measuring groundwater.
- E: Expand linkages between land use and water management: Agriculture needs to be explicitly mentioned.

- H: Clarify and refine State leadership: Group thinks that H &R should be integrated into one.
- O: Estimate environmental water needs: environmental water is separate than urban or ag.

Group 3:

- C: Expand groundwater analysis in water plan: Land use water linkages need to be expanded.
- O: clarify environmental water. Delta salinity. Exotic species issue. Hardscaped waterways and receding watershed, opening up permeability there.
- D. Coastal- economics of it. Not eliminating laws, but clarifying laws.
- Elements in data (K,L,M) are inseparable.
- G. Economics/Finances- always a challenge.

Group 4:

- B: Stormwater could stand on its own.
- C: A lot of data that is already out there, there is a tremendous amount of opportunities in the future.
- E: Very important especially in integrating flood planning
- F: Rolling plans together. Important. Also, the mining of future water supplies- that data can be used.
- K&L: very important. Also instrumental for enhancing L.
- N: Critical
- O: Critical

Group 5:

- General Comment - Sort out roles of state and regional
- E&G- possibly most important. Include flood management.
- A. Expanding WQ throughout- very important. Need to take into account economic impact.
- C. Groundwater- politically feasible>??
- D: Near coastal- growing issue. As we look more and more to the ocean for freshwater.
- E. Land and water management- not sure how feasible
- F: vehicle to" where does IRWM fit into this?"

Group 6:

- E: Important.
- F: Important.
- C. Groundwater: Very important.
- M &N: Very important, if CWP can't mandate there needs to be a way to track progress.
- O: Important.

Group 7:

- B. Flood management: This should be managed in regards to supply and not just safety.
- C. Groundwater: Regional tolerances are different.
- F. Land use planning: E & Q: the shorter planning horizon should be beneficial.
- O: Important- needs to be looked at carefully.

Luncheon Speaker

During the Lunch Session, Brian Leahy, Assistant Director of the Department of Conservation, provided an overview of the future of Natural Resource Management in California. He recapped some of the efforts by Resources Secretary Lester Snow to encourage management of natural resources in a systemic, integrated way that recognizes interdependencies and results in sustainability. During the session, he reviewed the concepts of Ecosystem Services, Total Resource Management, Integration of Multiple Objectives and more. He then reviewed a series of successful case studies that demonstrated these concepts. He ended with a list of recommendations that was emerging from the larger resource management community.

The presentation offered a number of ideas for use in the afternoon workshop session.

Recess and Reconvening

For the afternoon session, the Public AC recessed and reconvened into a joint Workshop with individuals interested in Regional Forums and Topic Caucuses.

REGIONAL FORUM AND TOPIC CAUCUS WORKSHOP

During the Regional Forum and Topic Caucus Workshop, meeting participants engaged in two rounds of breakout discussions related to 13 different topic and regional areas. The regional discussions focused on three areas:

- Delta and San Joaquin
- Southern California
- North-Central California

Topic areas addressed were:

- Agricultural Water Supply and Demand
- Data and Tools
- Groundwater
- Integrated Flood Management
- Local Government
- Near Coastal
- Resource Stewardship
- Urban Water Supply and Demand
- Water Quality and Public Health.

During each breakout discussion, participants brainstormed the key factors (or scope) associated with the given topic or area. Each breakout group also identified groups and individuals who could contribute to, or would be interested in, further developing a particular topic/area. Breakout conversation highlights are summarized below. More lengthy transcripts of notes from each breakout group are posted on the Water Plan *Calendar and Materials* webpage at http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/2010.cfm.

During the ***Regional*** breakout discussions participants emphasized the need for describing **local conditions**, including water quality, local IRWM priorities, regional self-sufficiency, and the

relationship between land use and water management. They noted this included implications for public safety, economic sustainability, and ecosystem functions. Conversations relating to regional self-sufficiency covered various suggestions on conjunctive use approaches (including potential new sources of water supply and rethinking management of flood waters), as well as matching water quality to use. For example, some asked if there are agricultural crops that remain viable using water with higher salt content. Discussions of regional considerations also encompassed the impact of land use patterns and Area of Origin water rights and watershed conditions. The broad scope of potential regional issues validated the need for coordination of various water management and planning efforts. It also pointed out the need to revisit options for structuring the content and size of the Water Plan Regional Reports, including online data management.

Ideas generated during the sessions also included suggestions for outreach and stakeholder engagement. At the regional level, many thought it would be important to involve a wide array of representatives including those from:

- Local government: City Councils, Boards of Supervisors, Councils of Governments, and engineering staff
- Economic activities: Agriculture, industry, Chambers of Commerce, development agencies
- Local entities: Water districts, NGOs, homeowner associations
- Local efforts involved with restoration, planning, water conservation
- Other agencies: Federal, Tribal and State programs, including power and energy

During the ***Topic*** breakout sessions, participants collectively emphasized the need for collaboration and coordination between agencies and organizations associated with all aspects of water management and planning.

During the topic discussions, observations about various issues many times bridged more than one group discussion.

In groups discussing **Water Supply and Demand,** some observed that important factors were similar for both agricultural and urban water use. Many identified a need to consider conjunctive use of alternative supplies (reuse, stormwater); as well as land management influences (productivity and cropping patters for agriculture; development and zoning for urban); climate change impacts on hydrology, infrastructure and system operations; funding needs for further gains in efficiency; and, revisiting landscape concepts (ecosystem services, urban density patterns, agriculture values for habitat).

During discussions of comprehensive water management, participants highlighted the role of **data and tools** in supporting better understanding of water-related resources, including surface and groundwater interactions and groundwater resource conditions. Many believed that to successfully incorporate a comprehensive water planning approach one needs to look at system-wide factors and activities, including water rights allocations, water transfers, and water marketing.

Many found that **water quality** is another component that needs to be included in comprehensive water management and planning. Discussions on this topic identified the importance of factoring in community drinking water supplies, sediment loading, pollution sources and patterns, water treatment systems, and costs for new levels of treatment.

Groundwater conditions represented yet another factor necessary to consider in comprehensive water management and planning. Participants again highlighted the need for adequate **data and tool**s. They felt the understanding of groundwater resources varies throughout the state. Some groundwater basins are well defined, and their associated characteristics and recharge processes well understood. In other areas, efforts are targeted at understanding groundwater basin parameters (including water quality, surface elevation levels, connectivity with surface waters, and recharge mechanisms and vulnerabilities). **Energy costs** must also be considered in evaluating management of groundwater use, as well as system operations of surface supplies.

Many believed that including **Integrated Flood Management** in the Water Plan would require a consideration of aspects of water supply, systems operations, conjunctive use and water quality and also links to land use, agricultural lands, ecosystem restoration and wildlife habitat.

Some noted that regional differences are important in flood management, with different approaches to funding, jurisdiction, and regulation found throughout the state. Flood risks vary as well across alluvial, riverine and coastal flooding, as well as differences in flood patterns in upper and lower watersheds.

Others emphasized that planning for Integrated Flood Management would require incorporation of water management and planning with emergency planning and response. It was suggested that integrating flood management with local IRWMs would be important for implementation efforts and for outreach and education on flood risks.

Another widely held view was that **Local Government** activities tie directly into water planning through land use, governance, and funding considerations. Local land use decisions often consider development strategies in the context of water supply. Some participants pointed out that General Plans can provide guidance on other aspects of development, such as impact on water conservation and reuse, drainage patterns, recharge areas, infrastructure needs – as well as energy efficiency and downstream impacts.

It was agreed that **Resource Stewardship** management and utilizing the services of functioning ecosystems and watersheds related to many aspects of water management and planning including floodplain management, the natural capacity to capture and release stormwater flows, water quality, and habitat. Many felt a Water Plan discussion of resource stewardship should include a description of ecosystem values and services, water needs for supporting ecosystem functions, climate change impacts and adaptive capability, and CEQA requirements and review processes. Other concepts for inclusion were species conservation and addressing challenges of invasive species. It was noted that the efforts of smaller watershed groups and water districts, with on-the-ground experience, would be especially important to consider when integrating IRWM planning efforts and funding opportunities.

Near Coastal conditions relate to many of the water management topics already mentioned, including water quality, water supply, conjunctive use. Those discussing this topic believed the unique aspects for coastal water management must also be considered. These included the role of ocean desalination as a water supply, freshwater flows to the ocean, power and energy (especially tidal energy), ocean acidification, and the importance of coastal wetlands as habitat and breeding grounds.

Summary of Themes and Discussion Topics

A consistent theme across the various breakout sessions was to seek best practices and lessons learned from other areas, and to provide success stories and templates. Another consistent message was the need to identify conditions and factors that are consistent across regions and areas, as well as aspects that are unique and location-specific.

Each breakout session also identified many key groups and individuals working on the respective topics and in the State's regions. The specific suggestions ranged across: Federal, Tribal, State, Regional, and Local departments, programs, agencies, and staff; non-government organizations; academia; elected officials; environmental justice and disadvantaged communities, small and individual well systems economic and business interests; agricultural, industry, and environmental interests; and water agencies (at wholesale and retail level). As noted previously additional detail is provided in the session transcripts, posted on the Water Plan website for the Public AC meeting.

RECONVENE – PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Following the joint workshop, the Public Advisory Committee reconvened and group members shared highlights of the discussion.

General Business

Facilitator Beutler quickly reviewed key elements of the Group Charter. The Charter had been provided at the time individuals volunteered for membership. Based on that process the Charter stands as presented unless members request amendments. No amendments were offered; however, she noted that members may offer amendments at future meetings.

Other – Several group members asked that the Water Plan team develop a meeting schedule for the full year to better accommodate member schedules. Paul Massera agreed to provide such a schedule.

NEXT STEPS

Paul Massera thanked all the Public Advisory Committee and Workshop participants for their feedback, noting that it would be considered in moving forward. He noted that Judie Talbot, CCP, would be convening Regional workgroups in early 2011, and that she would use the information received in this meeting to form the groups.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Kathryn Cox
Update 2013 Water Plan Coordinator
&
Assistant Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy
California State University, Sacramento